

Sent By: Ernest A. Beutler, Attorney at ; 949 717 4825;

Jun-5 2:49PM;

Page 4/4

App. No.:10/063870
Filed:May 21, 2002

Page 4 of 4

REMARKS

Claims 1, 12 and 13 have been amended to correct the typographical errors that occurred when this application was converted into the form for electronic filing.

Aside from the foregoing formal corrections the claims are being resubmitted for reconsideration inasmuch as they are believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record, for the reasons now to be set out.

All claims stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) on Okumura. Although the Examiner has attempted to point out how he believes the claims read on the reference, his reading is incorrect and not consistent with the reference's disclosure.

As is stressed in applicant's disclosure, the problem with the prior art methods is that the welding operation is continued for a preset time. Applicant's invention is the controlling of the welding time so that the welding operation is only continued for as long as necessary to establish a good bond.

Contrary to the Examiner's reading, the reference applied varies the electrical power to maintain it constant, but does not contain a single disclosure or comment about the welding time being varied. Therefore, in the absence of more pertinent art and art that deals with the issue of determining the welding time on a piece to piece basis, favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted:

Ernest A. Beutler
Reg. No. 19901

Phone (949) 717- 4821
Pacific Time